



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/283,542	04/01/1999	JAMES R. H. CHALLENGER	YO999-039-(8	1176

7590 10/27/2003

FRANK CHAU
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES
1900 HEMPSTEAD TURNPIKE
SUITE 501
EAST MEADOW, NY 11554

EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/283,542

Applicant(s)

CHALLENGER ET AL.

Examiner

William L. Bashore

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment and RCE, both filed 8/11/2003, to the original application filed 4/1/1999.
2. The rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12, 15, 17-18, 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. The rejection of claims 4, 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich, and Arora has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. The rejection of claims 6, 13, 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich, and Weinberg has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
5. The rejection of claims 7, 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich, and Dozier has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
6. The rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich, and Shoham has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
7. Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 15, 21, 22 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

8. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/11/2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12, 15, 17-18, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich (hereinafter Gramlich), U.S. Patent No. 5,826,025 issued October 1998, in view of Halliday et al. (hereinafter Halliday), U.S. Patent No. 5,880,740 issued March 1999.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Gramlich teaches construction of a web document comprising merging of parts of a document with annotation overlay(s) ("fragments" of the final document) provided by a user or annotation server (Gramlich Abstract, column 2 lines 39-43; compare with claim 1 "*A computer-executable method for constructing a plurality of objects, comprising the steps of:*", and "*providing at least one fragment*"). Gramlich does not specifically teach "*a plurality of objects*", as claimed, however, Gramlich teaches multiple annotations as applied to document merging (Gramlich Figure 1), as well as serially connecting annotation files (Gramlich column 6 lines 49-57), which provides the claimed equivalent of a plurality of objects, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret Gramlich in this fashion, providing the benefit of annotations (fragments) indicative of various diverging commentary from different authors.

Gramlich does not specifically teach said fragments defined as an object which is a component of an object constructed using said fragment. However, Halliday teaches creation of a composite image using various

Art Unit: 2176

images defined by zones, said image placement defined via rules (Halliday Abstract, column 5 lines 3-7, 13-27). The various images (components of a final composite image) are used in combination with associated definition data to construct the final composite image, said composite image can be applied to a Web page (Halliday column 6 lines 41-53, column 8 lines 31-34, 62-67, column 9 lines 1-8). Compare with claim 1 “... *wherein a fragment is an object that is a component of an object which is constructed using the fragment*”. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Halliday to Gramlich, providing Gramlich the benefit of simplifying the production of images and annotations to its documents (see Halliday column 7 lines 39-43).

Gramlich teaches determining an order for inclusion of annotations within a document based upon the merged inclusion of Source 1 annotations only after inclusion of Source 2 annotations occur (Gramlich column 5 lines 52-67, especially column 6 lines 1-5, and lines 49-58). Gramlich also teaches pattern fields for parsing and processing patterns of words that the system must operate on in an ordered manner (Gramlich column 9 lines 19-34). Gramlich also teaches merging annotations in an order determined by the precedence of the associated operation (Gramlich column 11 lines 61-67). Compare with claim 1 “*determining an order for constructing objects based on at least one inclusion relationship between an object and the at least one fragment*”).

Gramlich teaches an Annotation Overlay Proxy (AOP) for constructing the merged web documents as described above (Gramlich column 5 lines 18-40; compare with claim 1 “*constructing the plurality of objects based on the at least one inclusion relationship and the determined order for constructing the objects.*”).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Gramlich teaches determining an order for inclusion of annotations within a document based upon the merged inclusion of Source 1 annotations only after inclusion of Source 2 annotations occur (Gramlich column 5 lines 52-67, especially column 6 lines 1-5, and lines 49-58). Gramlich also teaches pattern fields for parsing and processing patterns of words that the system must operate on in an

Art Unit: 2176

ordered manner (Gramlich column 9 lines 19-34). Gramlich also teaches merging annotations in an order determined by the precedence of the associated operation (Gramlich column 11 lines 61-67). Compare with claim 2.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Gramlich teaches determining whether an annotation directory contains overlays for the overlay groups specified a user, and to issue a message specifying the overlay groups not currently represented in said annotation directory (Gramlich column 11 lines 15-39; compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claim 5, Gramlich does not specifically disclose examining objects, rejecting based on content, and approving publication of remaining objects, as claimed. However, Gramlich teaches an embodiment comprising a magazine model, where paid authors submit annotations to a centralized editor, who then edits and publishes the author's overlays in groups manages by the editor (Gramlich column 8 lines 47-54), providing the claimed equivalent of examining/rejecting/approving objects. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to interpret Gramlich in this fashion, providing Gramlich with the suggested advantage of submitting annotations to a magazine editor with well known duties of editing, rejecting and accepting stories for publication.

In regard to independent claim 8, claim 8 reflects the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 9-10, 12, claims 9-10, 12 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 2-3, 5 respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to independent claim 15, claim 15 reflects the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Gramlich teaches an Annotation Overlay Proxy (AOP) which analyzes and parses documents that includes patterns (Gramlich column 5 lines 45-55, column 10 lines 60-63, column 11 lines 62-67; compare with claim 15 “*parser*”, “*analyzer*”, and “*constructor*”).

In regard to dependent claim 17, Gramlich teaches submission of annotations from users (Gramlich column 8 lines 40-54; compare with claim 17).

In regard to dependent claim 18, Gramlich does not specifically teach a consistency checker for preventing publication of inconsistent objects, as claimed. However, Gramlich teaches an embodiment comprising a magazine model, where paid authors submit annotations to a centralized editor who then edits and publishes the author’s overlays in groups managed by the editor (Gramlich column 8 lines 47-54), providing the claimed equivalent of a consistency checker. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret Gramlich in this fashion, with the suggested advantage of submitting annotations to a magazine editor with duties of rejecting stories for publication due to various inconsistencies.

In regard to dependent claim 20, Gramlich teaches a system which merges annotation overlays on top of documents, resulting in a final HTML document (Gramlich column 6 lines 16-24; compare with claim 20).

In regard to independent claim 21, claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to independent claim 22, claim 22 reflects the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claim 21, and is rejected along the same rationale.

11. Claims 4, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich and Halliday as presented in claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Arora et al. (hereinafter Arora) U.S. Patent No. 5,911,145 issued June 1999.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Gramlich teaches an embodiment comprising a magazine model, where paid authors submit annotations to a centralized editor who then edits and publishes the author's overlays in groups manages by the editor (Gramlich column 8 lines 47-54) (a typical duty of a magazine editor is rejecting stories due to various inconsistencies). Gramlich does not specifically teach delaying publication in response to a first object being non-existent. However, Arora teaches a "Don't Publish" button, giving the user the option of not publishing a Web page (Arora column 6 lines 17-24, column 9 lines 17-25; compare with claim 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to Gramlich, providing the magazine editor of Gramlich the capability of not publishing Web documents due to various circumstances (i.e. past a deadline, etc.).

In regard to dependent claim 11, claim 11 reflects the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claim 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

12. Claims 6, 13, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich and Halliday as presented in claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of Weinberg et al. (hereinafter Weinberg), U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962 issued November 2000.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Gramlich does not specifically teach automatically detect broken hypertext links. However, Weinberg teaches a Web site visualization system whereby broken links are detected and automatically fixed (Weinberg Abstract near middle, column 18 line 24; compare with claim 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Weinberg to Gramlich's magazine embodiment, providing authors of Gramlich the capability of updating an author's information by detecting broken links within the annotation overlays to be merged with Web documents, keeping information current.

In regard to dependent claim 13, claim 13 reflects the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 19, claim 19 reflects the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

13. **Claims 7, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich and Halliday as presented in claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Dozier et al. (hereinafter Dozier), U.S. Patent No. 5,870,552 issued February 1999.**

In regard to dependent claim 7, Gramlich does not specifically teach automatically detecting/updating objects. However, Dozier teaches publishing Web documents over a network, whereby content can be replaced regarding updating of a company logo, or a URL shared by many documents (Dozier column 8 lines 30-39, Figure 10b-10d; compare with claim 7). Since Dozier teaches a form for entering user comments with a logo (that can be automatically updated) (Dozier Figure 10c), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dozier to Gramlich's magazine embodiment, providing authors of

Art Unit: 2176

Gramlich the capability of updating an author's logo and/or URL within the annotation overlays to be merged with Web documents to keep information current.

In regard to dependent claim 14, claim 14 reflects the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.

14. **Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich and Halliday as presented in claim 15 above, and further in view of Shoham, U.S. Patent No. 5,855,015 issued December 1998.**

In regard to dependent claim 16, Gramlich does not specifically teach dependency graphs. However, Shoham teaches directed graphs for retrieving hyperlinked resources associated with resources added by authors (Shoham column 3 lines 1-10, column 6 lines 40-60, Figure 2; compare with claim 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Shohom to Gramlich, providing Gramlich the capability of directed dependency graphs to more efficiently retrieve hyperlinked resources.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 8/11/2003 have been carefully and fully considered, but are not persuasive.

It is respectfully noted that Applicant's arguments regarding amended subject matter is currently moot in view of the new grounds of rejection incorporating the newly applied Halliday reference.

Art Unit: 2176

Applicant argues on pages 8-10 of the amendment that Gramlich does not specifically teach and/or suggest a "fragment", or determining an order for constructing objects based upon inclusion relationships as presently claimed. The examiner respectfully maintains that the overlays of Gramlich can be interpreted as a form of fragment (since they are components of a final document). However, Halliday is used to reject Applicant's amended clarification of this term.

It is additionally noted that Gramlich teaches determination of an order (i.e. Source 1 merged with the base document only after all annotations from Source 2 are merged - Gramlich column 6 lines 55-58), which has a direct bearing on the creation of the final finished Web document. Gramlich's directives are initially used to direct various annotations to be merged with a Web document by integrating HTML formatted content (see also Gramlich column 6 lines 16-24).

16. Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.

Nakao	U.S. Patent No. 6,061,697	issued	05-2000
Sidana	U.S. Patent No. 6,571,295	issued	05-2003

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is (703) 308-5807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 11:30 AM to 8:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on (703) 305-9792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Art Unit: 2176


18. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703-872-9306) (for formal/after-final communications intended for entry)

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).**



William L. Bashore
Patent Examiner, AU 2176
October 16, 2003